

“pop-up” interface 160 allowing users to comment on portions of the document designated by the author. The system of Day also provides a comment database 226 of solicited comments (FIG. 8 and col. 8, line 40 to col. 9, line 24).

Although, Day may appear to be similar to the present invention, Day does not disclose or suggest the present invention’s use of “evaluations” and creation of “a single review result . . . based on the collected evaluations and/or comments” (claim 1). Independent claims are amended to further clarify and emphasize the patentably distinguishing feature of the present invention. The present invention is a document system that processes “critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of a form critiqued by reviewers” and “generating a single critique analysis based on the collected critiques.” In particular, a critique can include a comment, an evaluation, a correction and/or a suggested change.

Therefore, in contrast to Day, using amended claim 1 as an example, the present invention provides:

. . .

- a determination unit which determines, based on information received from said communication unit, whether the information is critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of a form critiqued by reviewers;
- a storing control unit storing the critiques, as collected critiques in said memory unit; and
- a creating unit generating a single critique analysis based on the collected critiques when a predetermined number of critiques have been stored in said memory unit.

Day appears to allow for categorization of comments into a comment, a typo, a problem and an issue in relation to a review. However, Day does not disclose or suggest “determining” whether received information is “critique instructions” of a form, which includes instructions on correcting and/or providing suggested changes. Therefore, Day does not allow for and does not receive “critique instructions.”

Further, the Examiner acknowledges that Day does not disclose or fairly suggest that Day’s review system creates “a single review” (Office Action, page 3, lines 8-9). Nevertheless, the Examiner relies on Yu for the present invention’s patentably distinguishing feature of “a single review result.”

However, the mere fact that prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by the Examiner does not make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. In re Fritch, 23 USPQ 2d 1780, 1783-1784 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The Examiner can satisfy a prima facie case of obviousness by only showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references. *Id.* at 1783.

Because, Day, as the Examiner has also acknowledged, does not fairly suggest the present invention's patentably distinguishing features, then one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine Day with Yu. Further, as discussed further below, Yu does not relate to the field of the present invention, which undermines the rationale that one skilled in the art of the present invention would have knowledge of Yu, and undermines the rationale that if a system, such as Day, were combined with Yu, the combined system would disclose the claimed present invention. In contrast to Yu, the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 1 provides "a single critique analysis," which is an analysis of the critiques. An analysis of critiques differs from Yu's monthly statement as merely a compilation of a single payer's own data and statistical information based upon the compilation of the single payer's data.

Support for the amendments can be found on page 19, lines 3-7 of the application and FIG. 8 regarding the correction form.

Yu

Yu discloses a system processing handwritten or computer-generated bank checks for classification of its expenditures through the banking system (i.e., categorization of expense disbursements according to the payer's checks) (col. 1, lines 7-10 and col. 2, lines 50-53). More particularly, the system of Yu provides a report card of financial expenditures for the prior period (col. 7, line 1 to col. 8, line 17).

The Examiner appears to assert that in Yu a payer's payment category input corresponds to a comment and that Yu's system providing a monthly statement based upon the input payment categories corresponds to "a single review result." However in contrast to Yu, in the present invention, "critiques" are collected from a plurality of document "reviewers."

In Yu, a first payer only provides bank check comments and not "critiques" of the checks. Further, in Yu, the first payer comments on the payer's own checks and other payers are not commenting on the first payer's check. In Yu, the monthly statement is merely a collection of the payer's own comments and not an "analysis" of the comments from many reviewers. Therefore,

Yu does not relate to the present invention and cannot suggest to one skilled in the art of the present invention, the features of the present invention omitted in Day. Even if Yu was combined with Day, the combined system does not disclose or suggest the claimed present invention. In contrast to Yu, the present invention as recited in amended independent claim 1 provides "a single critique analysis," which is an analysis of the collected critiques from a plurality of "reviewers."

DISTINCTIONS OF THE CLAIMED PRESENT INVENTION OVER THE PRIOR ART

First, to support obviousness, there must be suggestion in the prior art. The Examiner acknowledges that Day does not fairly suggest the present invention's patentably distinguishing features (Office Action, page 3, lines 8-9). Therefore, the Examiner's obviousness rejection cannot be supported by combining Day and Yu.

Second, even if one combined Day and Yu, the combined system does not disclose or suggest "generating a single critique analysis based on the collected critiques," because Yu does not relate to "critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes" as well as Yu does not collect comments from a plurality of document reviewers. Yu only discloses a payer providing comments regarding the payer's own document (i.e., the bank check).

Therefore, in contrast to Day and Yu, the present invention, using the recitation of claim 1 as an example, provides:

... critique instructions, including corrections and/or
suggested changes, relating to contents of a form critiqued by
reviewers;
...
... generating a single critique analysis based on the
collected critiques when a predetermined number of critiques have
been stored in said memory unit.

Further, in contrast to Day and Yu, the present invention, using the recitation of claim 2 as an example, provides:

an updating unit which updates the contents of the form
stored in said first memory unit by using the statistical data created
by said creating unit.

In view of the remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-10 and allowance of claims

1-10 is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIMS

New claim 11 and 12 recite patentably distinguishing features of their own. Support for the new claims 11 and 12 can be found based on the disclosure of FIGS. 3 and 6 (for example, pages 11 and 13 of the application).

In contrast to Day and Yu, the present invention as recited in new claim 11, comprises:

... a review request form and a reviewed form, and
the review request form comprises reviewer information,
deadline information, and form storage information, and
the reviewed form comprises data of phrases to be
critiqued and relevant information to the phrases.

As disclosed about FIG. 3, a review request form includes reviewer information, a deadline and a location where a document to be critiqued is stored. As benefit examples, because reviewer information, such as addresses, reviewer organization information, etc., are included in the review request form, it is easy for the reviewers to understand what products and what organization sections are relevant to the document to be critiqued.

As disclosed about FIG. 6, a reviewed form includes phrases to be critiqued and relevant information to the phrases. As benefit examples, because phrase numbers are appended to the phrases, it is easy for the reviewers to specify the phrase to be critiqued (see new claim 12). Further, the relevant information to the phrases facilitates the reviewers obtaining knowledge on contents of the forms being critiqued. Further, the phrase number can be useful in categorizing the replies from the reviewers. Further, because the forms are stored in the memory unit and the document to be critiqued is accessible on the Internet, the reviewers can critique the document at any time.

In view of the remarks, allowance of new claims 11 and 12 is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "**Version with markings to show changes made.**"

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 3, 2003

By: 
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

700 Eleventh Street, NW, Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are **AMENDED** as follows.

New claims 11 and 12 are **ADDED** as follows.

Recitation of all pending claims is provided for reference convenience.

1. (TWICE AMENDED) A document review apparatus comprising:
 - a communication unit connected to a network and performing communication with other devices;
 - a memory unit;
 - a determination unit which determines, based on information received from said communication unit, whether the information is [information holding evaluations and/or comments] critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of a [reviewed] form [reviewed] critiqued by reviewers;
 - a storing control unit [which stores information, which has been determined by the determination unit to be information holding evaluations and/or comments relating to contents of a reviewed form] storing the critiques, as collected [evaluations and/or comments]critiques in said memory unit; and
 - a creating unit [which creates] generating a single [review result information] critique analysis based on the collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques when a predetermined number of [evaluations and/or comments] critiques have been stored in said memory unit.
2. (TWICE AMENDED) A document review apparatus comprising:
 - a communication unit connected to a network and performing communication with other devices;
 - a first memory unit which stores a [reviewed] form which is to be [reviewed]critiqued by a plurality of reviewers;
 - a second memory unit;
 - a determination unit which determines, based on information received from said communication unit, whether the information is [information holding evaluations and/or comments] critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of [a reviewed]the stored form [reviewed]critiqued by the reviewers;
 - a storing control unit [which stores information, which has been determined by the

determination unit to be information holding evaluations and/or comments relating to contents of a reviewed form] storing the critiques, as collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques in said second memory unit;

a creating unit [which creates] generating statistical data relating to the collected [evaluated and/or comments] critiques when a predetermined number of [evaluation and/or comments] critiques from the plurality of reviewers have been stored in said second memory unit; and

an updating unit which updates the contents of the [reviewed] form stored in said first memory unit by using the statistical data created by said creating unit.

3. (ONCE AMENDED) The document review apparatus according to claim 2, further comprising:

a notification unit which notifies the plurality of reviewers that a [reviewed] form to be [reviewed]critiqued is stored in said first memory unit; and

a transmission unit which, when information having a predetermined format and comprising address information has been received by said communication unit, uses said communication unit to transmit information which corresponds to the [reviewed] form stored in said first memory unit to a device identified by said address information.

4. (TWICE AMENDED) The document review apparatus according to claim 2, further comprising:

a display unit displaying textual information; and

an input unit inputting commands, wherein

said updating unit including,

a display control unit which allows said display unit to display the contents of the [reviewed form] stored form in said first memory unit in a format enabling an update result using statistical data created by said creating unit to be understood; and

a contents updating unit which updates the contents of the [reviewed form] stored form in said first memory unit based on a command which is input via said input unit while said display control unit is controlling the display.

5. (AS UNAMENDED) The document review apparatus according to claim 4, further comprising:

a second display control unit which allows said display unit to display a graph based on

the statistical data created by said creating unit.

6. (TWICE AMENDED) A document review system comprising:
a plurality of document review apparatuses; and
a network which connects said plurality of document review apparatuses, wherein each document review apparatus comprises,
a communication unit connected to a network and performing communication with other devices;
a memory unit;
a determination unit which determines, based on information received from said communication unit, whether the information is [information holding evaluations and/or comments] critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of a [reviewed] form [reviewed] critiqued by reviewers;
a storing control unit [which stores information, which has been determined by the determination unit to be information holding evaluations and/or comments relating to contents of a reviewed form] storing the critiques, as collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques in said memory unit; and
a creating unit [which creates] generating a single [review result information] critique analysis based on the collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques when a predetermined number of [evaluations and/or comments] critiques have been stored in said memory unit.

7. (TWICE AMENDED) A document review system comprising:
a plurality of document review apparatuses; and
a network which connects said plurality of document review apparatuses, wherein each document review apparatus comprises,
a communication unit connected to a network and performing communication with other devices;
a first memory unit which stores a [reviewed] form which is to be [reviewed]critiqued by a plurality of reviewers;
a second memory unit;
a determination unit which determines, based on information received from said communication unit, whether the information is [information holding evaluations and/or comments] critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of [a reviewed]stored form [reviewed]critiqued by the reviewers;

a storing control unit [which stores information, which has been determined by the determination unit to be information holding evaluations and/or comments relating to contents of a reviewed form] storing the critiques, as collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques in said second memory unit;

a creating unit [which creates] generating statistical data relating to the collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques when a predetermined number of [evaluations and/or comments] critiques from the plurality of reviewers have been stored in said second memory unit; and

an updating unit which updates the contents of the [reviewed] form stored in said first memory unit by using the statistical data created by said creating unit.

8. (TWICE AMENDED) A computer-readable recording medium which stores programs allowing a computer to operate as a document review apparatus, said document review apparatus including,

a communication unit connected to a network and performing communication with other devices;

a memory unit;

a determination unit which determines, based on information received from said communication unit, whether the information is [information holding evaluations and/or comments]critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of a [reviewed] form [reviewed] critiqued by reviewers;

a storing control unit [which stores information, which has been determined by the determination unit to be information holding evaluations and/or comments relating to contents of a reviewed form] storing the critiques, as collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques in said memory unit; and

a creating unit [which creates]generating a single [review result information]critique analysis based on the collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques when a predetermined number of [evaluations and/or comments] critiques have been stored in said memory unit.

9. (TWICE AMENDED) A computer-readable recording medium which stores programs allowing a computer to operate as a document review apparatus, said document review apparatus including,

a communication unit connected to a network and performing communication with other devices;

a first memory unit which stores a [reviewed] form which is to be [reviewed]critiqued by a plurality of reviewers;

a second memory unit;

a determination unit which determines, based on information received from said communication unit, whether the information is [information holding evaluations and/or comments]critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, relating to contents of [a reviewed]stored form [reviewed]critiqued by the reviewers;

a storing control unit [which stores information, which has been determined by the determination unit to be information holding evaluation and/or comments relating to contents of a reviewed form] storing the critiques, as collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques in said second memory unit;

a creating unit which creates statistical data relating to the collected [evaluations and/or comments] critiques when a predetermined number of [evaluations and/or comments] critiques from the plurality of reviewers have been stored in said second memory unit; and

an updating unit which updates the contents of the [reviewed] form stored in said first memory unit by using the statistical data created by said creating unit.

10. (TWICE AMENDED) A computer system, comprising:

a programmed processor to store a document, to transmit the document to users that [review]critique the document via a network, to receive document [evaluations and/or comments] critique instructions, including corrections and/or suggested changes, from the users via the network, to generate statistical data based upon the [evaluations and/or comments]critique instructions, and to update the document based upon the statistical data.

11. (NEW) The document review apparatus according to claim 1, wherein the memory unit stores a review request form and a reviewed form, and

the review request form comprises reviewer information, deadline information, and form storage information, and

the reviewed form comprises data of phrases to be critiqued and relevant information to the phrases.

12. (NEW) The document review apparatus according to claim 11, wherein phrase numbers are appended to the phrases to specify a phrase to be critiqued by the phrase number.